

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are presently pending. Claims 1-20 have been rejected. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1-6, 13 and 19 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added herein.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,595,856 to Ginsburg, et al. (“Ginsburg”). In particular, the Office Action states, “Ginsburg discloses . . . providing a configurator . . . transferring a *configuration* file from said configurator to said [programmable] device; *configuring* said [] device with said *configuration* file; and comparing [] data from said *configuration* file with [] data from a separate custodial file (col. 4, 16-29)” (emphases added). Applicants respectfully traverse.

In order to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every limitation of that claim. Applicants respectfully submit that Ginsburg does not teach or concern itself with a *configuration* process as is presently claimed. In particular, Ginsburg does not teach the use of gaming machine *configuration* files that are transferred from a configurator to a volatile programmable electronic device within the gaming machine where such *configuration* files are then compared against a separate custodial file, particularly with respect to a gaming machine boot process and the *configuration* of the volatile programmable device. Rather, Ginsburg is generally concerned with solving problems involving the requirements for using ROM in a gaming machine and the limitations of ROM devices contrasted with increased memory needs for advanced gaming applications. More particularly, Ginsburg is concerned with the verifying and authenticating of *game program software* and related data files upon loading into a gaming machine from a mass storage system. *See*, Ginsburg at col. 1, lines 16-56.

Ginsburg does not specifically address how such *new and advanced game program software and the corresponding need for increased ROM storage* related issues, or the solutions offered therefor, apply to the original *configuring* of volatile programmable devices within a gaming machine during an overall boot process of a gaming machine. Nothing in the referenced passage at column 4 of Ginsburg, or anywhere else in Ginsburg, supports the apparent conclusion that Ginsburg teaches or suggests the use of *configuration* files and the use thereof to perform the configuration of a volatile programmable device (such as an FPGA) during a boot process.

Furthermore, beyond Ginsburg being concerned with game files and the present claims being made with respect to configuration files, the actual authentication or verification that is performed in Ginsburg is accomplished with respect to hashed files to compute a verification code. *See, Ginsburg at col. 4, lines 3-28.* Such verification codes are what are actually compared in Ginsburg. Conversely, the present claims require the comparison of an actual representative portion of the configuration file with an actual representative portion of the custodial file. A hashed file or other relatively complex digital signature type feature is not used for comparison in the present claims, nor could such an item be used with a relatively simple volatile programmable electronic device (such as an FPGA), as will be readily understood by those skilled in the art.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Ginsburg does not anticipate these claims.

Nevertheless, although not believed to be necessary, independent claims 1, 13 and 19 have still been amended herein to more clearly articulate that which is being claimed in the interests of furthering and expediting prosecution. In particular, these claims have all been amended to clarify that a *read only configuration file* is used in configuring a pertinent volatile programmable electronic device. Further, claims 1 and 19 have been amended to clarify that the claimed methods involve authenticating *configuration data during a machine boot process*,

and to also add the steps of: holding the operating contents of a volatile programmable device as substantially empty upon a shut down phase; booting up the machine after the shut down phase; confirming whether the configuration file has been successfully compared to the custodial file; and permitting a substantial amount of regular machine operations only after a successful confirming step. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the claims as originally filed and/or other broadened claims in this and/or a continuing application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ginsburg does not teach or suggest the use of *configuration* files in the claims as filed, and that Ginsburg does not teach or suggest all limitations of these claims as amended in any event. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 13 and 19 are patentable over the prior art of record for at least these reasons.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-12, 14-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg alone. In particular, the Office Action states, “Regarding claim 20: Ginsburg teaches . . . storing a configuration file [and] a separate custodial file . . . holding the operating contents of said FPGA as substantially empty upon a shut down phase . . . booting up the [] machine . . . and configuring said FPGA with said configuration file (col. 1 59-67, col. 2 1-19).” Applicants respectfully traverse.

In order to render a claim as obvious, a reference or combination of references must teach or reasonably suggest each and every limitation of that claim. Applicants respectfully submit that Ginsburg does not teach or reasonably suggest every limitation of claims 2-12 and 14-18, and of independent claim 20 in particular.

With respect to claim 20, Ginsburg simply does not specifically teach or concern itself with the configuration of volatile programmable electronic devices within a processor-based machine. In particular, Ginsburg does not teach or suggest the use of processor based machine

configuration files that are transferred from a configurator to a volatile programmable electronic device within the processor based machine where such *configuration* files are then compared against a separate custodial file, particularly with respect to a processor based machine boot process. In addition to the specific points made above with respect to other claims, Ginsburg also does not appear to teach many other steps that are specific to claim 20 as originally filed. Such other steps include, for example, holding the operating contents of a FPGA as substantially empty upon a shut down phase, booting up the machine, comparing actual representative portions of data from the configuration and custodial files themselves, and configuring the FPGA with the configuration file.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ginsburg does not render independent claim 20 as obvious for the numerous reasons provided above, and as such this claim has not been amended herein. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 for at least the reasons provided above.

Claims 2-12 depend from independent claim 1, while claims 14-18 depend from independent claim 13. As such, these claims are patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as provided above for claims 1 and 13.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in proper form and condition for patentability, and accordingly request a Notification of Allowance to that effect. Appropriate consideration for a one-month petition of time fee is being submitted herewith. If such consideration is inadvertently omitted, and/or should any other fee be due in connection with this paper or for this application in general, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fee or fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0388, referencing Docket No. IGT1P096. If there are any questions or issues remaining, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

Date: March 16, 2007 /justinwhite/
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001
Justin A. White, Esq.
Reg. No. 48,883